



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/187,370	11/06/1998	DONALD C. WILCOXSON	22-0009	2971

7590 05/07/2004

TRW
LAW DEPARTMENT
ONE SPACE PARK
BUILDING E2/6072
REDONDO BEACH, CA 90278

EXAMINER

ABELSON, RONALD B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2666

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/187,370

Applicant(s)

WILCOXSON ET AL.

Examiner

Ronald Abelson

Art Unit

2666

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-10,21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-10,21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 November 1998 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2666

Withdrawal of Finality

1. The indicated allowability of claims 1, 6-10, 21, and 22 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Seshadri. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 6-10, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olds (5,574,969) in view of Seshadri (US 6,044,073).

4. Regarding claim 1, Olds teaches a method and apparatus for interference management of a communications satellite serving multiple user terminals in a satellite based cellular communications system (fig. 1).

Art Unit: 2666

Regarding claims 1, the system comprises receiving a request for service from a user terminal (col. 9 lines 23 - 26).

Regarding claims 1, the system comprises accessing a database parameter of communications system parameters including user terminal database parameter (fig. 6 box 98, col. 9 lines 58-59), antenna pattern parameters (antenna pattern, col. 10 lines 1-4), spacecraft/antenna point error parameters (Doppler frequency shift, col. 10 lines 1-4). Note, the Doppler frequency error can be due to movement of the antenna, and link condition parameters (effects of propagation delay, col. 4 lines 3-4).

Regarding claim 1, the system applies an algorithm to at least one communications system parameter to determine a connection parameter to minimize intra-system interference based in part upon the database of communications system parameters for the user terminal (non-interfering channel is chosen, col. 10 lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 1, the system allocates the connection and makes the connection (fig. 6 box 100, col. 10 lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 1, the system makes a communications connection with the processing communications satellite by the user terminal using the connection parameter (fig. 6 box 100, col. 9 line 66 - col. 10 line 4).

Art Unit: 2666

Although Olds teaches multiple user terminals, the reference is silent on prioritizing the multiple user terminals according to a selected criteria, wherein the selected criteria includes an amount of error correction selected by the user terminal, as specified in claim 1; and the selected criteria includes bandwidth selected by the user terminal, as specified in claim 21.

Seshadri teaches prioritizing the multiple user terminals according to a selected criteria (sensitive to signal errors, col. 2 lines 9 - 17), wherein the selected criteria includes an amount of error correction selected by the user terminal (time modulation, col. 7 line 66 - col. 8 line 9) , as specified in claim 1. Note, the examiner maintains that certain terminals will have data that is more sensitive to signal error than others and therefore will request a greater degree of time modulation. Regarding claim 21, the selected criteria includes bandwidth selected by the user terminal. Note, time modulation is dependent upon the amount of bandwidth available for use (col. 2 lines 32-34).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having both Olds and Seshadri before him/her and with the teachings [a] as shown by Olds, an interference management of a communications satellite serving multiple user

Art Unit: 2666

terminals in a satellite based cellular communications system, and [b] as shown by Seshadri, time modulation, to be motivated to modify the system of Olds by prioritizing different users according to their sensitivity to signal errors and having the users transmit data with varying degrees of time modulation. This can be accomplished by following the time modulation algorithm of Seshadri (fig. 3 box 313, 315, col. 7 line 66 - col. 8 line 9). The algorithm may be implemented in software. This would improve the by applying greater error protection to data that is sensitive to signal errors.

Regarding claim 6, monitoring if the communications connection is still active (Olds: fig. 6 box 94, col. 9 lines 23 - 26).

Regarding claim 7, redetermining the connection parameter based upon an updated communications system parameter (Olds: col. 10 lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 8, the connection parameter is a frequency channel (Olds: channel, col. 10 lines 1-4).

Art Unit: 2666

Regarding claim 9, time slot assignment (Olds: col. 3 lines 43-44).

Regarding claim 10, updating the group of communications systems parameters after the communications connection ends (Olds: pre-planned assignment pools, col. 10 lines 17-19). The examiner maintains that the pre-planned assignment pools may be formed after the communications connection ends.

5. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Olds and Seshadri as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Solondz (US 5,615,249).

Although the combination teaches prioritization based upon a selected criteria, the combination is silent on the selected criteria includes a fee schedule of the users terminal.

Solondz teaches, in a cellular environment, prioritization based upon fee (col. 2 lines 46-52).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having both the combination of Olds and Seshadri and Solondz before him/her and with the teachings [a] as shown by the combination of Olds and Seshadri, an interference management of a communications satellite serving

Art Unit: 2666

multiple user terminals in a satellite based cellular communications system, and [b] as shown by Solondz, in a cellular environment, prioritization based upon fee, to be motivated to modify the system of the combination of Olds and Seshadri to be motivated to modify the system of the combination by prioritizing users based upon fee. This could be accomplished by storing in the database a fee schedule identifier for each user. This modification can be performed in software. This would improve the system by allowing priority users access to the system despite excess demand on the network (col. 2 lines 46-52).

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald Abelson whose telephone number is (703) 306-5622. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on (703) 308-5463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2666

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RA
Ronald Abelson
Examiner
Art Unit 2666

4/19/04

Seema S. Rao
SEEMA S. RAO 4/27/04
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600